(Revised 06/08)

papers may be made.

United States District Court Northern District of Illinois MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAR PRO HAC VICE

Case Title:	PRECI-DIP SA	Plantiff(s)	
	VS.		
r	TRI-STAR ELECTRONICS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Defendant(s)	
Case Number:	1:08-cv-4192 Judge: Ronald A. Guzma	n	
Ι,	TODD M. SORRELL	nereby apply to the Court	
under Local Ru	ale 83.14 for permission to appear and participate in the above-entitled ac	tion on behalf of	
TRI-	m I have been retained.		
I am a member	in good standing and eligible to practice before the following courts:		
	Title of Court	Date Admitted	
SEE ATTACH	IMENT		
	•		
	y, or within the year preceding the date of this application, made pro hac llowing actions:	vice applications to this	
Case Numb		Date of Application (Granted or Denied)*	
*If denied, ple (Attach addition necessary)	-		
Pursuant to Local time of filing their	I Rule 83.15(a), applicants who do not have an office within the Northern District of r initial notice or pleading, a member of the bar of this Court having an office within the	Illinois must designate, at the is District upon who service of	

If you have not designated local counsel, Local Rule 83.15(b) provides that the designation must be made within thirty (30) days.

Has the applicant designated local counsel? Yes •

No C

Has the applicant ever been: censured, suspended, disbarred, or witherwise disciplined by any court?	Yes C	No (•
or is the applicant currently the subject of an investigation of the applicant's professional conduct?	Yes (No (•
transferred to inactive status, voluntarily withdrawn, or resigned from the bar of nay court?	Yes C	No 🧿
denied admission to the bar of any court?	Yes C	No 🕞
held in contempt of court?	Yes C	No 🤄

NOTE: If the answer to *any* of the above questions is yes, please attach a brief description of the incident(s) and the applicant's current status before any court, or any agency thereof, where disciplinary sanctions were imposed, or where an investigation or investigations of the applicant's conduct may have been instituted.

I have read the Rules of Professional Conduct for the Northern District of Illinois, effective November 12, 1991 (Local Rules 83.50 through 83.58), and the Standards for Professional Conduct within the Seventh Federal Judicial Circuit, effective December 15, 1992, and will faithfully adhere to them. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

August 6, 20	008	S/						
Date	Electronic Signature of Applicant							
Applicant's Name	Last Name SORRELL		First Name TODD		Middle Name/Initial M.			
Applicant's Law Firm	FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.							
Applicant's Address	Street Address 555 S. FLOWER STREET				Room/Suite Number 41ST FLOOR			
	City LOS ANGELES	State CA	ZIP Code 90071	Work Phone No	amber 3) 892-9200			

(The pro hac vice admission fee is \$100.00 for cases filed before February 1, 2001, and \$50.00 for cases filed on or after that date, and shall be paid to the Clerk. No admission under Rule 83.14 is effective until such time as the fee has been paid.)

NOTE: Attorneys seeking to appear pro hac vice may wish to consider filing a petition for admission to the general bar of the Court. The fee for admission to the General Bar is \$100.00 The fee for pro hac vice admission is \$100.00 for cases filed before February 1, 2001, and \$50.00 for cases filed on or after that date. Admission to the general bar permits an attorney to practice before this Court. Pro hac vice admission entitles an attorney to appear in a particular case only. Application for such admission must be made in each case; and the admission fee must be paid in each case.

ATTACHMENT

COURT ADMISSIONS

Todd M. Sorrell (CA State Bar No. 175143)

STATE COURTS

California State Bar, December 8, 1994

California Supreme Court, December 8, 1994

FEDERAL COURTS

United States District Court, Central District of California, December 8, 1994

United States District Court, Eastern District of California, January 13, 1997

United States District Court, Northern District of California, March 10, 1997

United States District Court, Southern District of California, August 22, 1996

United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, December 16, 1994

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, July 10, 2001